

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
NORTHERN DIVISION

CORIELLE JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:13-CV-260

v.

HON. ROBERT HOLMES BELL

WILLIAM JONDREAU, et al.,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On July 22, 2014, United States Magistrate Judge Timothy P. Greeley issued a report and recommendation (“R&R”) recommending that Defendant Zaki’s motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 23) be granted, that Defendant Zaki be dismissed from this action, that Defendant Zaki’s motion to modify the Case Management Order (ECF No. 39) be denied as moot, and that Plaintiff’s request to amend his complaint to name Dr. Aster Berhane instead of Dr. Zaki (ECF No. 7) be denied. (ECF No. 44, R&R.) Plaintiff filed objections to the R&R on July 31, 2014. (ECF No. 47.)

This Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the R&R to which specific objection has been made, and may accept, reject, or modify any or all of the Magistrate Judge’s findings or recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). “[A] general objection to a magistrate’s report, which fails to specify the issues of

contention, does not satisfy the requirement that an objection be filed. The objections must be clear enough to enable the district court to discern those issues that are dispositive and contentious.” *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995).

Plaintiff does not object to the dismissal of Defendant Zaki. His only objection is to the Magistrate Judge’s denial of Plaintiff’s request that Aster Berhane be replaced for Defendant Zaki as the correct defendant. (ECF No. 7.) The Magistrate Judge denied Plaintiff’s request because Plaintiff failed to submit a proposed amended complaint with a motion to amend his complaint. (ECF No. 44, R&R 2.) Plaintiff objects to this ruling because he was never given any notice that he needed to file a complete complaint in order to change a name in a complaint. On July 31, 2014, Plaintiff filed a motion to amend his complaint with a proposed amended complaint. (ECF No. 46.)

Pleadings filed by pro se litigants are held “to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.” *Thomas v. Eby*, 481 F.3d 434, 437 (6th Cir. 2007) (quoting *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972)). Nevertheless, a pro se litigant is still required to comply with the basic rules of the court. *Fitts v. Sicker*, 232 F. App’x 436, 441 (6th Cir. 2007) (citing *McNeil v. United States*, 508 U.S. 106, 113 (1993)). The Magistrate Judge correctly held that a party who wishes to amend his complaint must file a motion and an amended pleading, rather than simply a request for an amendment. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b)(1) (“A request for a court order must be made by motion.”); *see also* W.D. Mich. LCivR 5.7(f) (requiring the filing of proposed pleadings). Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's objections to the R&R (ECF No. 47) are **OVERRULED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** the July 22, 2014, R&R of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 44) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.

Dated: August 18, 2014

/s/ Robert Holmes Bell  
ROBERT HOLMES BELL  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE